

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 12, 18, 19 and 25 are amended herein. Claims 26-44 are added herein. Claims 1-44 are now pending in the application.

The Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider his earlier rejections in light of the following remarks. No new issues are raised nor is further search required as a result of the changes made herein. Entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

**Claims 1-25 over Norris**

In the Office Action, claims 1-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Norris et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,805,587 ("Norris"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-11 recite, *inter alia*, an Internet communication module that is adapted to cause a message formatter to send a personalized notification message to a called-but-busy party upon request from a remote telephone user. Claims 12-17 and 19-24 recite, *inter alia*, notifying an Internet user through a personalized message that a calling party is requesting access to the Internet user. Claims 18 and 25 recite, *inter alia*, notifying an attempted calling party of a likelihood the Internet user is connected with an Internet to allow said calling party an opportunity to give the Internet user a personalized message.

Norris appears to teach a method and apparatus of notifying an Internet user of a caller while the Internet user's telephone station is connected to the Internet (Abstract). If an Internet user is busy on the Internet, an alerting message is given to the Internet user that a call is waiting (Norris, col. 6, lines 28-33). The Internet user is given the options of connecting the caller to voice mail, terminating the call or connecting the call (Norris, col. 6, lines 34-36). Connecting the call allows real-time conversion of a caller's voice to digital form, transmission over the Internet and reconstruction of the voice of the caller at an Internet terminal (Norris, col. 7, lines 5-53).

Norris teaches that an Internet user is notified that a calling party desires to speak to the Internet user, and the Internet user responds by picking an option for the calling party. Norris' Internet user is notified of a calling party's

desire to access the Internet user through a “canned” announcement (Norris, col. 6, lines 29-39). Norris fails to teach allowing a calling part attempting to access an Internet user to utilize a personalized message, as respectively claimed by claims 1-25.


A benefit of sending a personalized message versus a “canned” message to an Internet user is, e.g., giving the Internet user more information when deciding to take a call. A personalized message may allow an Internet user to continue uninterrupted without having to converse with a calling party if a calling party only needs to relay information not needing a reply.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1-25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

  
William H. Bollman  
Reg. No. 36,457

**Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC**  
2000 M Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036-3307  
TEL. (202) 261-1020  
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df